

## REVISION BY SCHEDULES

## Plan of New Democratic Tariff-makers.

## BAILEY'S SCHEME IGNORED

## Committee Assignments Discussed—Broussard's Bill Causes Stir at Capitol.

[From The Tribune Bureau.]  
Washington, Jan. 20.—A schedule-by-schedule revision of the tariff, to follow the naming of the committee of the next House, was declared today to be the plan of the new Ways and Means Committee elected by the Democratic caucus last night.

The fourteen members of the new committee will hold a meeting next Friday, and will proceed immediately to make up a slate of the choice committee assignments, beginning with the Rules Committee. When the standing committees have all been named by the Ways and Means Committee, which also made it the committee on committee of the House, thus taking the appointive power from the Speaker, the tariff-making body will begin the drafting of proposed tariff bills.

According to Representative Underwood, chairman of the committee, the Democratic leaders have practically decided to adopt a schedule-by-schedule revision, thus ignoring Bailey's plan.

No tariff action will be taken by the Ways and Means Committee next Friday," said Mr. Underwood. "Tariff revision will probably not be taken until after March 4, and we expect to have a tariff bill ready when the 62d Congress meets, next December."

Representative Henry, of Texas, is expected to be named as chairman of the Rules Committee. The other Democratic members probably will be Fitzgerald, of New York; Stanley, of Kentucky; Graham, of Illinois, and Hardwick, of Georgia. As soon as it is organized, the Rules Committee will frame a set of tentative rule amendments for the next House.

New York Democrats are expected to insist that Representative Fitzgerald be made chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The Georgia delegation met in the House today and agreed to support Representative Adamson as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The virtual bolt from the caucus last night of Representative Broussard, of Louisiana, created a great deal of comment at the Capitol today. Mr. Broussard was left off the Ways and Means Committee by the Democratic caucus because he is what is known as a protectionist—he voted for duties on lumber and other home products. The discrimination against the people of his state, who believe in protection, Mr. Broussard declared in the caucus, will result in making that state Republican.

On the whole, however, the Democrats were congratulating themselves today on the manner in which the "caucus" went through last night, all the way from the unanimous nomination of Champ Clark to the ratification of the Ways and Means Committee selected in advance.

"It was a very harmonious meeting," said Mr. Clark. "It was particularly gratifying that there was a remarkable attendance, 220 of the 228 Democratic being present. Many of them had to come hundreds of miles to join in the deliberations of the caucus. The percentage of attendance of the new members was even greater than that of the old members, and there was not a hitch nor jar in the whole proceeding."

## "BATHTUB" RANKS WEAKEN

## Chattanooga Defendants Admit Illegal Agreement.

Washington, Jan. 20.—The Cahill Iron Works, at Chattanooga, Tenn., one of the defendants in the government prosecution of the so-called "Bathtub Trust," has changed its answer to the government's civil suit, and has entered what in a criminal action would amount to a plea of guilty.

Frank H. Cahill, president of the iron works, and John J. Mahoney, its vice-president and secretary, are co-defendants. In their amended answer they admit the alleged violation of the anti-trust law in the agreement with the Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Company, but set forth that on December 17 they withdrew from it and released all the jobs which were parties to the price-fixing contract.

The company says it has returned to the prices which prevailed before the trust agreement was made, and promises not to make another such agreement. It is willing to submit to the injunction the government seeks and will not contend further. Whether the company's attitude will have any effect on the government's criminal case has not been decided.

## NEW ORLEANS WINS A POINT

## House Committee Favors Holding Panama Canal Expedition There.

Washington, Jan. 20.—New Orleans won the first round of the fight over the location of the Panama Canal expedition today, when the House Committee on the House, by a vote of 8 to 6, decided in favor of it as the site for the fair to celebrate the opening of the Panama Canal in 1915.

After long consideration of the claims of New Orleans and San Francisco, the committee voted to report favorably the Estopinal bill, recognizing New Orleans and authorizing the selection of a board of commissioners, the making of a government exhibit, etc. No appropriation to aid the fair is authorized. It is understood, however, that the committee will favor a government exhibit, to cost approximately \$500,000.

The bill was referred to a sub-committee for perfection. This committee will report on Tuesday, and the bill will then be favorably reported to the House, where the New Orleans-San Francisco fight will be renewed.

## PANAMANIAN INSURANCE BILL

## Companies Must Invest or Deposit \$100,000—Arrest of Tovar.

Panama, Jan. 20.—The National Assembly, which was called in extraordinary session to deal with the financial situation, passed a measure today requiring insurance companies doing business in Panama to invest or deposit \$100,000 in this country. The law is to become effective one year from the date of enactment.

## URGES LONGER CHELSEA PIERS.

The board of directors of the Merchants' Association of New York declared itself yesterday in favor of making longer two of the Chelsea piers to accommodate the new Olympic and the Titanic. Resolutions adopted urged that the application for the piers be granted, "to the end that the greatest port of the country may be enabled to realize the benefit flowing from the expenditures by the federal government in the construction of channels into the port and the enlargement of the locks in the Panama Canal."

## THE DAY IN WASHINGTON

[From The Tribune Bureau.]  
Washington, Jan. 20.—CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.—Word has not yet been received from Ottawa approving the reciprocity agreement which has been completed by the negotiators in Washington, and until that is received the final agreement cannot be signed. To-day was spent by the negotiators in going over their work, making certain that no chance for any misunderstanding existed, and waiting for word from the Canadian capital. Secretary Knox has under consideration a plan which, if found practicable, would obviate the necessity of submitting a treaty to the Senate. This plan contemplates the passage of a joint resolution by the two houses authorizing the President to put into effect, as regards imports from Canada, the rates which have been tentatively agreed upon by the negotiators. Both the Canadian officials and those of the Department of State are hopeful that Ottawa will approve the agreement reached yesterday and that they may be able to sign it, and thus conclude their labors to-morrow.

BAILEY AND CLARK.—The Tribune's editorial assertion that "as revisionists the Speaker-to-be and the Texas incidental protectionist will always be at odds" finds many confirmatory echoes in Washington. Mr. Clark is sincerely convinced of the advisability of revision schedule by schedule. He is far from being even an incidental protectionist. He would, could he have his way, lower the rates of duty all along the line. He realizes to the full the difficulty which his party will have to encounter if it opens up the entire tariff question. He realizes the danger of dealing with Democrats who want protection for those industries in which they or their constituents are interested and free trade for those industries with which they have no concern, and he is wise enough to have profited by Republican experience and to wish to take a few schedules off the tariff bill, subject them to something approximating a careful examination, and then propose a reasonable reduction of the existing rates of duty.

On the other hand, is not only unalterably opposed to schedule by schedule revision, but he has no sympathy with the aims of the leader of the next House. He wants a scramble out of which he can grab the largest measure of protection for Texas, and he would welcome an opportunity to make deals to that end. Moreover, the Texas is intolerant of differences of opinion and arrogant to those who, however sincerely, presume to differ with him. By reason of his length of service in the Senate he occupies a more or less commanding position in the minority, and although his colleagues have always refused to trust him with actual leadership, he is capable of making the utmost trouble for the Missouri statesman who last night was nominated for the next Speakership. Speaking in public hearings, they say that if any interest wishes to be heard they will expect a general revision, but it appears to be their purpose to bring in a fairly general bill, so framed that the House can take up one or more schedules as it deems wise, and pass possibly a series of measures and send them over to the Senate.

The revolt of Representative Broussard, of Louisiana, in last night's caucus, and his declaration that the action of the Democratic members of the House in denying his state representation on the Ways and Means Committee affords a striking evidence of the wide diversity of opinion among among the Democrats with regard to the protective policy.

PENSION LEGISLATION.—The Senate leaders are anxiously casting about for some measure of compromise with regard to pension legislation which will fall short of increasing the pension burden of the government by \$40,000,000, as would the Sutherland measure, which has been passed by the House. Thus far their plans have not been worked out, but they believe that they can devise something which will not cost so much and on which they can get the House conferees to agree. The Republican leaders of the upper house do not hesitate to say that they seriously depreciate the effort of Speaker Cannon and other influential members of the House to increase the pension budget, but they are hardly prepared to reject the House proposition absolutely, even though they would never have brought it up, and for that reason they seek to formulate a compromise measure.

NEW YORK FOR TAIT.—Otto T. Barnard, who is in Washington, declared this evening that the New York delegation to the next national convention would stand solidly for the renomination of William Howard Taft. He further predicted that Mr. Taft would carry New York State and the country. When asked what chance there was of the discontented elements of both parties forming a coalition and a third party, he asserted that all such talk was "pure humbug."

## SENATE GETTING BUSY.

Senator Hale's admonitions appear to have had a salutary effect, and there is a prospect of real work in the Senate within a few days. Senator Clapp gave notice today that he would call up the Indian appropriation bill next Monday, and an effort is being made by the committee on Commerce to have the river and harbor bill ready to follow immediately after the Indian bill.

One clause of The Declaration of London of special importance to shipowners provides that the ship conveying contraband can itself be condemned if such contraband forms more than half the cargo either in value, weight, volume or freight.

## NEW ZEALAND'S MAIL SUBSIDY.

Wellington, New Zealand, Jan. 20.—Asked to explain the Vancouver mail service, the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Ward, the Prime Minister, said that New Zealand's subsidy to the service would be \$100,000 a year. As the service is between Vancouver and Auckland and Sydney, he added, it must be apparent that New Zealand was actuated by a cordial desire to work in accord with the commonwealth. He said he sincerely hoped that after the conference in London, Andrew Fisher, the Australian Premier, and Sir William Lawler, the Canadian Premier, a similar tariff infants to Australia in trade and tariff affairs would be brought about.

## PROTECTING MOUNT VERNON.

The Commission of Fine Arts has advised the President that the reform bill which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia purpose to erect at Belvoir, in the vicinity of Mount Vernon, is not objectionable on aesthetic grounds. The members say that the President's request for an opinion did not call on them to express an opinion based on sentimental grounds, and therefore they refrain from doing so. In support of the conclusion they point out that the proposed reform bill will be seen from Mount Vernon, and while it is to be a point of land next adjoining Mount Vernon, it will be built on the further side, that it will be a low building of only one story, will have no power plant, and will require only an inconspicuous landing on the river bank, while the buildings will be more than a mile inland. The commissioners further assert that the timber on this tract will not be cut for commercial purposes, and only so much wood will be cut as is necessary to permit farming operations. The President has given no indication of the action he will take pursuant to the report of the Fine Arts Commission, but as the matter has been taken up before the committees of Congress he may decide to leave it to Congress to decide finally whether or not sentimental reasons should prevail.

## PRESIDENT VETOES BILL

## Relief for Dishonorably Discharged Sailor Refused.

Washington, Jan. 20.—President Taft today vetoed a bill for the relief of Clarence Frederick Chatman, an enlisted man, who was dishonorably discharged from the United States navy. In returning the bill to Congress without his approval the President said:

"The beneficiary named in the measure was dishonorably discharged from the naval service in pursuance of the sentence of a general court martial for refusing to obey the order of a petty officer and for assaulting and striking him. These offenses are so grave as to make it subversive of discipline and a miscarriage of justice to grant him an honorable discharge. To approve the bill would be to nullify the value and high character of a honorable discharge, which is a testimonial of fidelity, obedience and ability during a long term of service."

## SEEKING OLD AGE PENSIONS

## Civil Service Retirement Association Working for Government Employees.

Washington, Jan. 20.—With a greater number of delegates in attendance than ever before, the United States Civil Service Retirement Association met here today in annual convention.

## FIGHTING NEW WAR RULES

## Lloyds Strongly Opposes Terms of the Declaration of London.

London, Jan. 20.—The fight against the ratification by Parliament of The Declaration of London, the agreement governing prizes in naval warfare, adopted at a conference of the chief naval powers two years ago, has now been taken up by Lloyds. The opposition already embraces practically all the Chambers of Commerce and shipowners of Great Britain. Concerted action with a view to influencing the House of Commons to reject the declaration will be taken.

Officials of Lloyds assert that if the declaration is accepted, the war risks on British shipping will be so high—at least 20 guineas per cent—that owners will be unable to send their vessels to sea.

Sydney, N. S. W., Jan. 20.—The Commonwealth government has drafted a series of resolutions stating its objections to the Declaration of London, which will be presented at the imperial conference next May. The Commonwealth strongly opposes the inclusion of foodstuffs as contraband.

## FAVOR DIRECT ELECTIONS

## Senators Differ on Supervisory Power of Congress.

## RAYNER STARTS THE DEBATE

## Menace to Constitutional Amendment Seen in Question of Federal Control.

[From The Tribune Bureau.]  
Washington, Jan. 20.—A division of the Senate along radical and conservative lines was indicated in today's debate on the constitutional amendment providing for the popular election of Senators, which was brought up in a speech by Senator Rayner. Discussion centered upon the question of whether or not Congress shall retain supervisory power over the elections. The charge that the resolution abandoned all federal power to the states in order to obtain the support of the Southern Democrats seemed to be substantiated by the debate. Senators Bacon and Rayner contended that this relinquishment of federal power was the very life of the amendment, and refused to consider the proposal made by Senator Brown, of Nebraska, to submit the question of a direct vote to the state legislatures first, and leave the question of federal supervision until later. The singular feature of the discussion was that all the Senators who took part are in favor of direct elections.

Senator Sutherland was the chief advocate of the retention of supervisory power by Congress over the elections. Much of the debate was a discussion of one phase or another of the problem of state rights. "The Senator is still an ambassador of the state," said Senator Sutherland, in support of his amendment. "But he is a Senator of the United States, and well a Senator of the United States, and it seems to me to be an anomaly that Congress should have no supervisory power over the election of the members of its higher branch."

Senator Brown asserted that the effort to give the states entire control over the elections would endanger the adoption of the amendment by many of the legislatures. Senator Rayner's speech.

Senator Rayner said he would vote for the resolution in obedience to the demand of the people, even if he were not favorable to the proposition himself. Still, he declared himself "earnestly and sincerely" for the amendment, and would advocate it with all his strength before the people of his state.

"While," he said, "I am opposed to amending the Constitution, except when the public sentiment of the country demands it, and while I am not led away in the slightest degree by popular passion or clamor, this great reform, in my opinion, must no longer be thwarted or impeded. Reading every utterance of the convention that framed the Constitution, so far as the same has been recorded, I never can acquiesce in the doctrine that a Senator represents his state in a political capacity in any greater degree than he does the people of the state that he represents."

"The provision that no state shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate cannot be amended without the consent of the state. If the election by the Legislature was deemed by the convention to have been of such great significance, why did not the convention make that clause of the Constitution unamendable without the consent of the state? The equality of representation was made unamendable because, with jealous vigilance, the men who framed the Constitution intended to protect the sovereign rights of sovereign states, and therefore they planted this clause in the body of the instrument, indestructible, perhaps, to all eternity."

"Had they failed to make the Constitution subject to amendment, perhaps it could not have been amended at all, except at the risk of revolution. There is a revolution on hand now, Mr. President. It is a peaceful revolution. It is a revolution of the majority of the American people against the political domination of the minority."

Mr. Rayner made an especial plea to Senators not to load down the resolution with amendments which would insure its defeat by the states, which would not surrender to Congress their right of control in elections.

## Question of Federal Control.

When in the course of his remarks Mr. Rayner attacked the Sutherland amendment giving Congress power to control the time and manner of electing Senators, Mr. Sutherland was pressed to say whether he would vote for the resolution without his amendment. Replying in the affirmative, he attempted to turn the tables by asking Mr. Rayner whether he would vote for the resolution if the amendment should be accepted. The Maryland Senator refused to commit himself on that point.

Urging his own amendment, Mr. Sutherland said it was marvellous how the Maryland Senator could be "so thoroughly right on the main proposition and so utterly wrong on the incidentals." Mr. Sutherland did not consider it desirable to deprive Congress of a function it exercised in the case of election of Representatives while it exercised it in the other. He argued there should be uniformity—Senators and Representatives both being subjected to the same control.

Senator Burton continued his argument against the postal subvention bill and was followed by Senator Cummins, who declared the principle unsound. Senator Newlands introduced an amendment to the bill, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct thirty auxiliary cruisers of sixty-five hundred tons each, not exceeding in aggregate \$20,000,000.

Mr. Burton asserted that not 5 per cent of the shipping of Great Britain is subsidized, and added that the aggregate of subventions in that country is nothing like as great as is contemplated in this bill. Mr. Gallinger challenged the statement, saying that while more than \$20,000,000 a year is paid out of the British treasury in aid of British shipping, not more than \$2,500,000 possibly could be paid out under his bill.

## MAIL CLERKS TO BENEFIT

## Bennet and Parsons Help to Get More Pay for Them.

[From The Tribune Bureau.]  
Washington, Jan. 20.—The salary of the overworked mail clerks engaged the attention of the House for several hours this afternoon in the debate on the postoffice appropriation bill, and as a result a provision for an increase for this class of postal employees was restored to the bill. The discussion was marked by an attack on the retrenchment programme of the Postoffice Department in its effort to reduce the deficit.

Representatives Bennet and Parsons, of New York, and Madden, of Illinois, led the fight for better salaries for the "special clerks" employed in the large city post-offices. Mr. Bennet's activities were largely the result of a recent conference with the postmaster of New York City.

When the appropriation bill was prepared this year the committee omitted any provision for "special clerks," a term by which the fast distributors and more expert mail handlers have been designated. Such an omission meant that the salaries of these clerks should not exceed \$1,500 a year, whereas, had the customary provision been made, postmasters might have been permitted to pay as much as \$1,800.

"Experts who have devoted years to the service and who have been proficient in the handling of mail are entitled to wages commensurate with their worth," said Mr. Bennet. His position was supported by Mr. Madden and Mr. Parsons, who protested against economy along these lines.

Members of the postoffice committee opposed the restoration of the item to the bill. After a long debate the term "special clerks" was inserted, as in former years, and this class of employees may receive the coveted increase.

The proposal that after January 1, 1912, delivery of mail by city carriers should be made only at such houses and places of business as should provide suitable reception.

## MAIL CLERKS TO BENEFIT

## Bennet and Parsons Help to Get More Pay for Them.

## RAYNER STARTS THE DEBATE

## Menace to Constitutional Amendment Seen in Question of Federal Control.

[From The Tribune Bureau.]  
Washington, Jan. 20.—A division of the Senate along radical and conservative lines was indicated in today's debate on the constitutional amendment providing for the popular election of Senators, which was brought up in a speech by Senator Rayner. Discussion centered upon the question of whether or not Congress shall retain supervisory power over the elections. The charge that the resolution abandoned all federal power to the states in order to obtain the support of the Southern Democrats seemed to be substantiated by the debate. Senators Bacon and Rayner contended that this relinquishment of federal power was the very life of the amendment, and refused to consider the proposal made by Senator Brown, of Nebraska, to submit the question of a direct vote to the state legislatures first, and leave the question of federal supervision until later. The singular feature of the discussion was that all the Senators who took part are in favor of direct elections.

Senator Sutherland was the chief advocate of the retention of supervisory power by Congress over the elections. Much of the debate was a discussion of one phase or another of the problem of state rights. "The Senator is still an ambassador of the state," said Senator Sutherland, in support of his amendment. "But he is a Senator of the United States, and well a Senator of the United States, and it seems to me to be an anomaly that Congress should have no supervisory power over the election of the members of its higher branch."

Senator Brown asserted that the effort to give the states entire control over the elections would endanger the adoption of the amendment by many of the legislatures. Senator Rayner's speech.

Senator Rayner said he would vote for the resolution in obedience to the demand of the people, even if he were not favorable to the proposition himself. Still, he declared himself "earnestly and sincerely" for the amendment, and would advocate it with all his strength before the people of his state.

"While," he said, "I am opposed to amending the Constitution, except when the public sentiment of the country demands it, and while I am not led away in the slightest degree by popular passion or clamor, this great reform, in my opinion, must no longer be thwarted or impeded. Reading every utterance of the convention that framed the Constitution, so far as the same has been recorded, I never can acquiesce in the doctrine that a Senator represents his state in a political capacity in any greater degree than he does the people of the state that he represents."

"The provision that no state shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate cannot be amended without the consent of the state. If the election by the Legislature was deemed by the convention to have been of such great significance, why did not the convention make that clause of the Constitution unamendable without the consent of the state? The equality of representation was made unamendable because, with jealous vigilance, the men who framed the Constitution intended to protect the sovereign rights of sovereign states, and therefore they planted this clause in the body of the instrument, indestructible, perhaps, to all eternity."

"Had they failed to make the Constitution subject to amendment, perhaps it could not have been amended at all, except at the risk of revolution. There is a revolution on hand now, Mr. President. It is a peaceful revolution. It is a revolution of the majority of the American people against the political domination of the minority."

Mr. Rayner made an especial plea to Senators not to load down the resolution with amendments which would insure its defeat by the states, which would not surrender to Congress their right of control in elections.

## Question of Federal Control.

When in the course of his remarks Mr. Rayner attacked the Sutherland amendment giving Congress power to control the time and manner of electing Senators, Mr. Sutherland was pressed to say whether he would vote for the resolution without his amendment. Replying in the affirmative, he attempted to turn the tables by asking Mr. Rayner whether he would vote for the resolution if the amendment should be accepted. The Maryland Senator refused to commit himself on that point.

Urging his own amendment, Mr. Sutherland said it was marvellous how the Maryland Senator could be "so thoroughly right on the main proposition and so utterly wrong on the incidentals." Mr. Sutherland did not consider it desirable to deprive Congress of a function it exercised in the case of election of Representatives while it exercised it in the other. He argued there should be uniformity—Senators and Representatives both being subjected to the same control.

Senator Burton continued his argument against the postal subvention bill and was followed by Senator Cummins, who declared the principle unsound. Senator Newlands introduced an amendment to the bill, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct thirty auxiliary cruisers of sixty-five hundred tons each, not exceeding in aggregate \$20,000,000.

Mr. Burton asserted that not 5 per cent of the shipping of Great Britain is subsidized, and added that the aggregate of subventions in that country is nothing like as great as is contemplated in this bill. Mr. Gallinger challenged the statement, saying that while more than \$20,000,000 a year is paid out of the British treasury in aid of British shipping, not more than \$2,500,000 possibly could be paid out under his bill.

## MAIL CLERKS TO BENEFIT

## Bennet and Parsons Help to Get More Pay for Them.

[From The Tribune Bureau.]  
Washington, Jan. 20.—The salary of the overworked mail clerks engaged the attention of the House for several hours this afternoon in the debate on the postoffice appropriation bill, and as a result a provision for an increase for this class of postal employees was restored to the bill. The discussion was marked by an attack on the retrenchment programme of the Postoffice Department in its effort to reduce the deficit.

Representatives Bennet and Parsons, of New York, and Madden, of Illinois, led the fight for better salaries for the "special clerks" employed in the large city post-offices. Mr. Bennet's activities were largely the result of a recent conference with the postmaster of New York City.

When the appropriation bill was prepared this year the committee omitted any provision for "special clerks," a term by which the fast distributors and more expert mail handlers have been designated. Such an omission meant that the salaries of these clerks should not exceed \$1,500 a year, whereas, had the customary provision been made, postmasters might have been permitted to pay as much as \$1,800.

"Experts who have devoted years to the service and who have been proficient in the handling of mail are entitled to wages commensurate with their worth," said Mr. Bennet. His position was supported by Mr. Madden and Mr. Parsons, who protested against economy along these lines.

Members of the postoffice committee opposed the restoration of the item to the bill. After a long debate the term "special clerks" was inserted, as in former years, and this class of employees may receive the coveted increase.

The proposal that after January 1, 1912, delivery of mail by city carriers should be made only at such houses and places of business as should provide suitable reception.

## FISH MUST PAY DUTY

## If Not Caught in Waters Covered by International Agreement.

## PUBLIC CENSURE OF SIMS

## Secretary Meyer Trusts It Will Be a Lesson to the Navy.

Washington, Jan. 20.—The general order of Secretary Meyer, reprimanding, in accordance with the instructions from the President, Commander W. S. Sims, of the battleship Minnesota for his "every drop of blood" speech in London on December 3, was made public today. After quoting the letter of the President, who said that Commander Sims's act was censurable and directed that he be publicly reprimanded, Secretary Meyer added these words in the general order:

A public reprimand is hereby administered to Commander W. S. Sims, U. S. N., and will be entered upon his official record. The gravamen of the offense is so clearly set forth in the above quoted communication from the President that no additional remarks appear necessary to indicate to the naval service the lack of tact and knowledge of the plain duty of an officer of the rank exhibited by Commander Sims upon the occasion mentioned and to prevent a repetition of such a regrettable occurrence.

The general order will be sent to every officer in the navy and posted on vessels and at the yards and stations.

## INTERNATIONAL COURTESY

Gloucester, Mass., Jan. 20.—Local fishing interests were gratified today by the receipt of a private dispatch from Newfoundland, saying that three Gloucester fishing boats caught in the ice in the Bay of Islands have been liberated by the Newfoundland cruiser Frons. The vessels are the S. F. Willard, Ella M. Goodwin and the S. F. Willard. As the cruiser was under no obligations to attempt to break the ice about the fishermen, the action is appreciated here as a bit of international courtesy.

## MAKING FISHERIES TERMS

## Newfoundland Premier Hopes for an Agreement with America.

St. John's, N. F., Jan. 20.—Satisfaction with the friendly spirit exhibited by the American negotiators in the conference last week at Washington between representatives of the United States and Newfoundland governments on the disputed points of the Hague award on the fisheries question was expressed today by Premier Morris.

The Premier, who returned from Washington last night, said that he believed an amicable arrangement was now possible regarding the details in dispute between the two countries. He also believed that the Americans, in return for minor concessions, were disposed to abandon attempts to use purse seines or to fish on Sundays.

## When They Read Today's News From

John Wanamaker's Store.

## No Time to Be Lost

## A Beautiful French Gown or Wrap Or Dainty Hat

## Only 511 Men Can Have One of These Fine Big Storm Coats at \$16.50

## All the Rest Will Have to Pay the Manufacturer's Usual Trade-mark Price of \$22.50 and \$35

## Worth Coming for Surely—Such Coat Selling Is, to Say the Least, Unusual

## Long ulsters—collars to be worn snugly upturned about the neck or in the lapel form on milder days. Warm without being bulky.

## Absolutely all-wool—otherwise they could not be sold in this store. Plain gray, Oxford, black, brown and fancy patterns. Some serge-lined, others half serge-lined, others of two-faced cloth, the double warp showing fancy backs. Patterns include checks, stripes and plaids. Knit wind-cuffs if desired.

## All the Cloth Is Cravenetted so that in addition to being warm coats for cold weather, they are dry coats in wet weather. All sizes.

## 218 High-grade Suits for Men, Mohair-lined, \$18.50

## Instead of \$25 to \$35

## We cannot describe in print the excellence of these suits. You simply must see them. All sizes. \$18.50.

## 189 Suits for Youths and Young Men, \$14.50

## Some purchased especially—others from regular stock—but all of \$18 to \$35 qualities. Some stouts. \$14.50. Main floor, New Building.

## Men's Soft Hats and Derbies at \$1

## Soft hats are "seconds" of \$2 and \$3 grades in black, tan and gray. Derby hats are "seconds" of \$3 to \$5 grades; mostly black.

## Defects very slight. Exceptional \$1 hat opportunities. Basement, Old Building.

## Annual Price-Saving on Men's Fur Caps

## Gloves, Collars and Foot Muffs

## Men's Shirts at \$1.35—Usual \$1.75 to \$2.50 Values

## Men's Scarfs, Worth Up to \$2.

## On Special Sale at 55c

## Main floor, New Building.

## A Question of Shoe Policy

## \$5 Shoe Value for \$3.65 or \$3.65 Value for Less?

We reasoned this way. "Here is a woman who ordinarily pays, say, \$3.50 for her shoes. Now it is better for her and better for us to give this woman the comfort and luxury of shoes worth a dollar and a half, and two dollars more, at her regular price, than to give her the same shoes as she usually gets at a lower price."

"She will find the finer shoes much more satisfactory and probably more economical in the end, and may continue to buy that quality, making of her a firmer friend of ours."

On this basis, we took advantage of the shoe factory's dull season to place an order at a special price for large quantities of women's shoes of excellent \$